

April 21, 1975

by this Legislature. I think that Senator Moylan, if he is not there, I will have to speak to his empty chair. If Senator Moylan was telling the truth about what these people said when they said they want to belong to the government, they want to support it by paying a tax on food, then he ought to go a step further and belong to the government by supporting a tax on intangibles. That's a windfall that is not even being taxed but they won't touch it. We are dealing with the people that are under-represented or totally unrepresented this morning. I think the amendment is fair and just and it ought to be accepted and Omaha ought to be left to her own devices, to its own devices.

PRESIDENT: Senator Duis.

SENATOR DUIS: Mr. President, members of the Legislature, I am at a loss now at the arguments against this particular amendment by the Omaha delegation or I shouldn't say that, by members from Omaha because they are now speaking for state support for education which would actually benefit them in the matter of real estate taxes and now they are talking about the sales tax being reduced which would take care and increase their real estate tax so I think probably we had better get one way or the other here and, actually, the \$6 would figure approximately what the \$16 increase would over the state and I think some of that would be coming back from the increased cost of food. This would be due to the increase in the economy and I doubt, seriously, if they would lose as much money as has been said.

PRESIDENT: Senator Barnett, do you want to close argument by way of reply?

SENATOR BARNETT: I am just going to take a couple of things so I will just make it short. Some of the comments that have been made, I think that if we do not have the gumption to return a tax on food to these cities that tax people for food now, then what you ought to do is take the rebate off the state tax because it is no different. It is treated the same. Senator Duis just about put the nail on the head as far as one certain group is concerned. I think he hit it real good. I think the bill, as Senator Syas probably said, it would kill the bill if it was adopted. I think he should remember one thing. If the Omaha delegation would back it for their people, it wouldn't have any problem of passing and I am sure he knows that. Senator Moylan did cause me a little concern when he said I don't have any business talking about this because I wasn't here the day it was made up. All I have to do is remind him he wasn't here the day the Constitution was made either and he talks on that plenty of times. So I don't think there is any reason for any kind of an argument like that. I think we owe it to the people in the cities that are taxing the 1%, and how they make it up, it should be the cities decision, the city councils instead of piggy-backing on the state issue. We give the rebate on the state level. Let's give it on the city level. I think it is only fair. Therefore, I move for the adoption of my amendment.

PRESIDENT: The question is, the adoption of Senator Barnett's